



INFORMS Transactions on Education

Publication details, including instructions for authors and subscription information:
<http://pubsonline.informs.org>

Case—Production Scheduling at Falcon Die Casting

B. Madhu Rao, Jeroen Beliën

To cite this article:

B. Madhu Rao, Jeroen Beliën (2014) Case—Production Scheduling at Falcon Die Casting. INFORMS Transactions on Education 15(1):154-155. <https://doi.org/10.1287/ited.2014.0132cs>

Full terms and conditions of use: <https://pubsonline.informs.org/Publications/Librarians-Portal/PubsOnLine-Terms-and-Conditions>

This article may be used only for the purposes of research, teaching, and/or private study. Commercial use or systematic downloading (by robots or other automatic processes) is prohibited without explicit Publisher approval, unless otherwise noted. For more information, contact permissions@informs.org.

The Publisher does not warrant or guarantee the article's accuracy, completeness, merchantability, fitness for a particular purpose, or non-infringement. Descriptions of, or references to, products or publications, or inclusion of an advertisement in this article, neither constitutes nor implies a guarantee, endorsement, or support of claims made of that product, publication, or service.

Copyright © 2014, INFORMS

Please scroll down for article—it is on subsequent pages



With 12,500 members from nearly 90 countries, INFORMS is the largest international association of operations research (O.R.) and analytics professionals and students. INFORMS provides unique networking and learning opportunities for individual professionals, and organizations of all types and sizes, to better understand and use O.R. and analytics tools and methods to transform strategic visions and achieve better outcomes.

For more information on INFORMS, its publications, membership, or meetings visit <http://www.informs.org>

Case Production Scheduling at Falcon Die Casting

B. Madhu Rao

School of Business Administration, Stetson University, DeLand, Florida, 32723, bmrao@stetson.edu

Jeroen Belien

Center for Information Management, Modeling and Simulation (CIMS), KU Leuven, B-1000 Brussels, Belgium,
jeroen.belien@kuleuven.be

Keywords: linear optimization; production planning; case study; spreadsheet optimization

History: Received: July 2013; accepted: August 2014.

Falcon Die Casting Company (FDC) is an automotive parts manufacturer based in Ohio. FDC recently patented an innovative method of high volume die casting using traditional die casting machines. This patent was instrumental in FDC receiving a long term contract from a major automobile manufacturer for the bulk of its requirements for five key die cast items used in most of its automobiles.

The customer provides FDC with an indication of the possible demand for the next 12 weeks with the understanding that demand beyond Week 2 is tentative and subject to change depending on auto sales during the preceding weeks. Table 1 shows the projected demand for the next 12 weeks.

FDC can produce the parts on five die casting machines, each of which is capable of producing a subset of the parts as indicated in Table 2. For example, Part 1 can be produced only on Machines 1 and 2.

Similarly, Machine 4 can only produce Parts 2 and 3. While FDC has the design capacity needed to meet the customer's long term demand for the five parts, the effective capacity at present is just enough to satisfy the demand because a significant percentage of items produced are not at a quality level demanded by the customer. This situation is likely to remain the same for the immediate future until the defect levels are gradually brought under control through experience and continuous improvement. FDC's industrial engineers developed yield factors, which are quite accurate in predicting the proportion of parts that meet the customer quality specifications. Table 2 provides the production rates for the five parts on the five machines along with the yield factors. For instance, producing Part 1 on Machine 1 for 3 hours yields 72 ($= 3 \times 40 \times 0.6$) items of Part 1 that meet the specifications and, thus, can be used to fulfill demand. There is no wastage of metal because defective parts can be melted and reused.

Production takes place Monday through Friday with three eight-hour shifts per day, yielding 120 hours

Table 1 Projected Demand

Week	Part 1	Part 2	Part 3	Part 4	Part 5
1	3,500	3,000	4,000	4,000	2,800
2	3,000	2,800	4,000	4,300	2,800
3	3,000	2,000	4,000	3,500	3,000
4	3,000	3,000	4,000	3,800	2,800
5	3,000	3,000	4,000	4,000	2,800
6	3,500	2,500	4,000	3,800	2,500
7	3,500	2,500	3,800	4,000	2,500
8	3,300	3,400	3,700	4,200	2,500
9	3,300	3,400	0	4,500	3,000
10	3,200	3,000	0	4,500	3,000
11	4,500	4,000	5,000	5,000	3,800
12	3,000	2,800	4,000	4,300	2,800

Table 2 Production Rates (Units/Hour)

	Part 1	Part 2	Part 3	Part 4	Part 5
Machine 1	40			60	
Machine 2	35	25			
Machine 3		30			45
Machine 4		35	50		
Machine 5				60	50
Yield (%)	60	55	75	65	60

Table 3 Part Setup Times (Hours)

	Part 1	Part 2	Part 3	Part 4	Part 5
Machine 1	8			8	
Machine 2	10	8			
Machine 3		10			24
Machine 4		8	12		
Machine 5				8	20

of regular time per week on each machine. Week-ends are normally used for preventive maintenance and experimentation to improve the production process but may be used for overtime production when necessary. Thus, the maximum possible overtime production on any machine is 48 hours per week. Based on the current projected demand for the five parts, FDC realized that overtime production over the week-ends will be a fact of life until the yields are sufficiently improved. Due to a long standing policy of not keeping any finished goods inventory at the end of a week, weekly production is limited to that week's demand.

Setting up machines to produce various parts takes significant amount of machine time, ranging from 8 to 24 hours as shown in Table 3 and setup times do not depend on the order in which the parts are produced on a machine. Setup and production of a part can span more than one shift without any lost time. However, as a consequence of preventive maintenance

and experimentation over the weekends, all machines need to be set up anew each week.

Weekly production planning is typically carried out in a time-consuming trial-and error-process by adjusting the previous week's production plan taking into account changes in the weekly demands, production rates, and setup times. While production planners do their best to avoid unnecessary setups, on many occasions production of a part had to be scheduled on more than one machine in order to meet the customer demand. Additionally, the final schedules often resulted in excessive overtime on some machines while other machines were idle during the regular time production.

Tom Kelley, the production manager, wanted scheduling to be carried out in a systematic manner with some assurance that the final schedule assigns production of parts to machines in an optimal manner. Since production employees are paid time and half for overtime work, Tom is very keen on meeting the demand for the five parts with the least amount of overtime.

Tom is also curious about the impact of the company policy to not carry finished-goods inventory from week to week. He has had discussions with the maintenance supervisor that lead him to believe that it should be possible to perform routine maintenance during weekends without disturbing the machine setups.